arXiv:cond-mat/9707161v1 16 Jul 1997

Oreg and Finkel'stein Reply: In the preceding Comment [1] Fabrizio and Gogolin (FG) dispute our result of the enhancement of the tunneling density of states (DOS) in a Tomonaga–Luttinger (TL) liquid at the location of a backward scattering defect [2]. They state that (i) the anticommutativity of the fermion operators of the left and right moving electrons was not considered properly; and that (ii) the tunneling DOS for this problem is given by $\rho(\omega) \sim \omega^{1/g-1}$ which is the tunneling DOS at the end of a TL wire. We disagree with both points. Moreover, we show below that the result of the Letter can be reproduced following the Comment when its calculations are performed correctly.

(i) There are different ways to get the correct commutation relations of the fermion operators in the bosonization technique. We have employed the variant with a proper regularization of the commutation relation of the bosonic fields. The commutation of the fields Φ and Θ (see the Comment) was taken as $[\Phi(x), \Theta(y)] = 2\pi i\,[\mathrm{sgn}\,(x-y) - 1]$ [3]; Φ and Θ are proportional to ϕ and $\widetilde{\phi}$ respectively in the notations of the Letter. This regularization gives the correct anticommutation relations between the right and left moving fermion operators. The minus sign in front of the term Z_{odd} in Eq. (7) of our Letter [2] is a result of these anticommutation relations.

(ii) The authors of the Comment got the following expression for the Green's function determining the tunneling DOS: $G^{(R)} \propto t^{-\frac{1}{2g}} \langle\uparrow| e^{iH_\uparrow t} e^{-iH_\downarrow t} |\uparrow\rangle$, where $H_{\uparrow,\downarrow} = H_0 \pm \frac{V_{bs}}{\pi\alpha} \cos\left[\sqrt{g}\Phi(x=0)\right]$. FG accept our conclusion that the Φ field at the impurity site develops a finite average value, the fluctuations around which are massive. In this case the analogy with the X-ray edge problem does not hold and $\langle\uparrow| e^{iH_\uparrow t} e^{-iH_\downarrow t} |\uparrow\rangle \propto \exp\left[-2i\frac{V_{bs}}{\pi\alpha} \langle\uparrow| \cos\left[\sqrt{g}\Phi(x=0)\right] |\uparrow\rangle\, t\right]$. Since the fluctuations of $\Phi(x=0)$ are massive, this correlator does not have a power law prefactor. This leads to the tunneling DOS obtained in Ref. [2]:

$$\rho(\omega) \sim \omega^{\frac{1}{2g}-1}, \tag{1}$$

where $g < 1$ for a repulsive interaction.

We show now that the different behavior of $\rho(\omega)$ obtained in the Comment is a result of a substitution of the backward scattering problem by another problem, which is not equivalent to the original one. In the calculation of $\langle\uparrow| e^{iH_\uparrow t} e^{-iH_\downarrow t} |\uparrow\rangle$ FG relied on their results for a finite chain of length L with *open boundary conditions*: $\psi(0) = \psi(L) = 0$, where ψ is the fermion field [4]. This problem is equivalent to a ring that has a cut at $x = 0$. FG used the operator $U = e^{i\pi J/2}$ to transform $H_\downarrow$ into $H_\uparrow$, where $J = \int_0^L (\rho_R(x) - \rho_L(x))\,dx$. This operation shifts $\Phi(x=0) \to \Phi(x=0) + \pi/\sqrt{g}$, but should not influence H_0. One can check, however, that $UH_0U^\dagger$ gives an additional term proportional to $\rho_R(0)+\rho_L(0)-\rho_R(L)-\rho_L(L)$ in the transformed Hamiltonian . Contrary to the problem with open boundary conditions there are no reasons for this term to vanish in the problem of a weak backward scattering. In the latter problem, as we have shown [2,3], the field $\Phi(x=0,t)$ is frozen at low temperatures. This leads to a vanishing of the current fluctuations (proportional to $d\Phi(x=0,t)/dt$), but not of $\rho_R(0) + \rho_L(0) \propto d\Phi(x=0,t)/dx$. This is why the low energy physics of the weak backward scattering defect is not equivalent to cutting the wire.

We would like to emphasize that the vanishing of the dc conductance with a power law behavior at low temperatures [5], is not in contradiction with the enhancement of the tunneling DOS. Since the current fluctuations are suppressed at low energies, one should include instantons in the calculation of the current–current correlation function [6,7] in order to obtain a non zero conductance. These instantons correspond to jumps of $\Phi(x=0)$ between subsequent minima of the term $\cos(\sqrt{g}\Phi(x=0))$ at some time. The configurations without instantons do not contribute to the zero frequency conductance, but they give the dominant contribution to the tunneling DOS. The first non vanishing contribution to the conductance is due to two instanton configurations. Their contribution to the tunneling DOS is much smaller than the contribution of the configurations without instantons. Thus, the description of the strong coupling regime by pinning of the Φ field, which leads to a freezing of the current fluctuations, is consistent with both the vanishing of the conductance and the enhancement of the tunneling DOS.

We demonstrate that the result of the Letter follows from the Comment when $\langle\uparrow| e^{iH_\uparrow t} e^{-iH_\downarrow t} |\uparrow\rangle$ is calculated correctly. This clearly indicates that the question about the anticommutation relations was raised by FG without serious grounds.

This work was supported by the Israel Academy of Science, Grant No. 801/94-1.

Yuval Oreg and Alexander M. Finkel'stein[†]
The Weizmann Institute of Science
Rehovot 76100, Israel
[†] Also at the Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, Russia.

---

[1] M. Fabrizio and A.O. Gogolin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 4527 (1997)

[2] Y. Oreg and A.M. Finkel'stein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4230 (1996).

[3] Y. Oreg and A.M. Finkel'stein, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 10928 (1996) (See Sec. IIB).

[4] M. Fabrizio and A.O. Gogolin, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 17 827 (1995).

[5] C.L. Kane and M.P.A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1220 (1992).

[6] A. I. Larkin and P. A. Lee Phys. Rev. B **17** 1596 (1978).

[7] A. Schmid, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51** 1506 (1983).